all this money but they have not done so. It is also surprising that this company is allowed to operate in the small-scale sector and that they have not applied to the Government for price approval as required under the Drug Price Control Order.

Sir, I shall request the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilizers not to be so much bogged down by bureaucratic delays and technical details, which has a paralysing effect on them for years and years to come. Para 16 of the Drug Price Control Order empowers the Government to fix up the price of any formulation, irrespective of the fact that the manufacturers have applied to the Government for price approval or not.

I shall, therefore, urge upon the Ministry to take note of the exorbitant price of Proxivon and accelerate the process of bringing down the price of this drug in the interest of the consumers.

REFERENCE TO THE ALLEGED DANGER TO RESIDENTS OF INDERPURI, NEW DELHI, DUE TO STRAY BULLETS COMING FROM THE SHOOTING RANGE OF RAJPUTANA RIFLES

SHRI SHANKARRAO NARAYANRAO DESMUKH (Maharashtra): Sir, I would like to bring to your kind notice that the residents of Inderpuri are living under a constant fear of death by stray army bullets which come from the Rajputana Rifles Shooting Range. The bullets pierce through doors and windows and land in the living rooms, bedrooms and terraces of their houses. A large number of residents have been injured and many more have had a providential escape. These bullets have caused great panic among the residents as they feel insecure inside as well as outside their houses. If bullets keep on coming at the present rate, some precious lives will be lost for no reason. It is appreciated that shooting practice is imperative for nation's security, but it cannot be at the cost of the life of innocent citizens.

Sir, I have got certain figures. Nearly 13 people have been injured. I will give you some of the instances. First is Samir Bose, aged 17 years. He was injured when a bullet hit his left shoulder. He was operated upon in the R. M. Lohia Hospital. The second one is Miss Poonam Makkar, aged 26 years. The bullet hit the left heel. She was operated upon in R. M. Lohia Hospital. The third one Mr. K. K. Verma, aged 45 years. The bullet got stuck up in the bathroom door when he was having a bath. When two children were playing in the playground, the bullet brushed them. One Mrs. Minocha, aged 45 years was hit. The bullets brushed past her saree when she was buying vegetables outside her house.

Sir, the residents of Inderpuri are in great danger. I would request the hon. Defence Minister to appoint an officer to record the statements and see the condition of the residents over there. Otherwise, a day may come when there will be a deadly case. I would request the Defence Minister to appoint a military officer to assess the exact situation and to remove the Rajputana Rifles farther away.

MOTION FOR ELECTION TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON OFFICES OF PROFIT

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI JAGANNATH KAUSHAL): Sir, I beg to move the following Motion:

"That this House concurs in the recommendations of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do elect three members of the Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit and resolves that the House do proceed to elect, in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote, three members from among the members of the House to the said Joint Committee to fill the vacancies caused by the retirement of Shri Robin Kakati, Shri Dinesh Goswami and Shri Lakhan Singh

[Shri Jagannath Kaushal]

The question was put and motion was adopted.

The question was put and motion was adopted.

I. STATUTTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY (SECOND) AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1984 (NO. 6 OF 1984) PROMULGATED BY THE PRESIDENT ON 21ST JUNE, 1984

II. THE NATIONAL SECURITY (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1984

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): I think each Member who has disapproved it should be allowed to speak. It is such a sinister Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is party-wise.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH(Rajasthan): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

> "That this House disapproves of the National Security (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1984 (No. 6 of 1984) Promulgated by the President on the 21st June, 1984."

Sir, this is not the first occasion when this House is discussing and expressing its views on ordinances converting themselves into Acts. I have various grounds on which my disapproval is based. My very first ground is that this particular ordinance relating to National Security Act Amendment is of questionable legality. It brings into conflict very serious legal, administrative and ethical questions, a substantive question between enacted law versus law in force. It also brings in its wake the question of executive veto over legislative will. To enable me to put across what I am saying about questionable legality, enacted law versus law in force and executive veto over legislative will, it is necessary, Sir, to very briefly review the whole genesis of how National Security Act has come into being. Article 22 of the Constitution, as originally conceived and enacted, recognised preventive detention. As a permissible means even in ordinary time for abridging the civil liberties of the people. Chapter 2 on Fundamental Rights, Sir, envisages preventive detention but the legislative powers of Parliament and of the States have been controlled by certain constitutional safeguards and those safeguards are incorporated in clauses (3) to (7) of article 22. By the Constitution 45th Amendment Bill of 1978, which was later passed and enacted and after Presidential assent became the 44th Amendment, three further restrictions were placed on the power of Parliament and the State Legislatures in respect of laws relating to preventive detention. These three restrictions of the 44th Amendment related to the maximum period for which a person could be detained, secondly, it made obligatory that any preventive detention law must provide that a State advisory board, which will exercise supervision in all cases of preventive detention, had to be composed of such members as the Chief Justice of the appropriate High Court of the State recommended. It was also obligatory for the law to provide that the chairman of the advisory board shall be a sitting judge of the appropriate High Court and that the other members of the board shall be sitting or retired judges of High Court. That was the second provision. The third was thatthe system of preventive detention without reference to the advisory board, subclause (a) of clause (7) of article 22, was also to stand ablished.

Sir, here we came across situation wherein a very serious wrong was done when legislative will was nullified by an executive veto. The